

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 679

CG 003 563

By-Boderick, Carlfred; And Others

Sex Education. Kaleidoscope.

SCOPE, Stony Brook, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date [68]

Note-43p.

Available from-Director of Educational Communication, SCOPE--Suffolk Educational Center, Stony Brook, New York 11790 (\$2.00).

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.25

Descriptors-*Curriculum Development, Personal Growth, *Personality Development, Personal Values, School Community Relationship, *School Responsibility, School Role, *Sex Education, Social Development, *Social Relations

This publication attempts to keep a portion of the educational community in touch with current topics and trends. The present focus is on sex education, a topic of growing concern in educational circles. The texts of three addresses are presented, with audience questions and speaker responses. Dr. Carlfred Broderick gives an overview of sex education: the role sex education plays in children's development; the meaning and implications for understanding emotions, social roles, and skills; and sex education's definition within the sphere of education. Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag asks if sex education in the schools is the solution, and gives may reasons why this is not an ultimate answer. Dr. Esther Schulz presents some practical aspects of introducing sex education into school programs, and sex education's relationships to community and student attitudes and conventional curriculum. This publication was transcribed, published and disseminated through funds from a Title III Elementary and Secondary Education Act grant. (BP)

KALEIDO SCOPE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



SCOPE

A Cooperative Effort Serving Suffolk Education



KALEIDO SCOPE

" OVERALL PICTURE OF SEX EDUCATION:
ITS MEANING, IMPLICATIONS, DEFINITION, ROLE . . ."
BY: DR. CARLFRED BRODERICK . . . 1

" IS SEX EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS THE
SOLUTION? "

BY: DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG . . . 16

" PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF INTRODUCING SEX
EDUCATION INTO SCHOOL PROGRAMS "

BY: DR. ESTHER SCHULZ . . . 30

SEX EDUCATION

VOL.1,NO.3

The Articles presented herein were developed pursuant to a Grant established under P.L. 89-10, Title III, ESEA, (OEG-1268) from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

SCOPE

A Cooperative Effort Serving Suffolk Education

Kaleidoscope is a vehicle of dissemination for Suffolk educators that attempts to keep the educational community of Suffolk "in touch" with current topics and trends.

This issue deals with the area of Sex Education which as of late is becoming of increasing importance to the school districts in the County. It is our intent that we present information relative to diverse views and perceptions. We believe this is an area of critical concern for the school districts and one which deserves serious consideration. SCOPE does not recommend any specific course of action to its member school districts other than the active consideration of alternatives. It is our expectation that this issue of Kaleidoscope will serve as a supplemental source of information in helping local school districts arrive at an appropriate decision.

William H. Heath
Executive Secretary, SCOPE

This publication has been transcribed, mimeographed and is being distributed as part of a Title III ESEA Grant from the U.S. Office of Education. One copy has been sent to each central administrative unit.

While the supply lasts copies may be purchased by agencies and individuals at \$2.00 per copy. Quantity orders of 50 copies 25% discount, quantities over 100 copies 50% discount.

Orders should be sent to: Director of Educational Communications, SCOPE-Suffolk Educational Center at Stony Brook, New York 11790.



DR. CARLFRED BRODERICK

"Overall Picture of Sex Education: Its Meaning, Implications, Definition, Role . . . "

CARLFRED BRODERICK, Ph.D., received a B.A. in Social Relations from Harvard College and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Child Development and Family Relations from Cornell University. He is presently an Associate Professor of Family Relations at the College of Human Development, the Pennsylvania State University where he teaches courses in Foundations of Marriage and Family Relationships and serves as advisor to graduate students in this field. He is a member of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, the Society for Research in Child Development and the National Council on Family Relations.

It's a pleasure to be here with all of you playing hooky from our mutual responsibilities. I have someone taking my class this morning; what are you doing? But it's a pleasure to be here to discuss with you Sex Education and its broad ramifications. Incidentally, I promised that my part of the program, that is my remarks and the discussion following, will make up ten minutes of the missing twenty and then, presumably, those that follow will take their responsibility. Nobody wants to miss out on lunch, in other words, so I will try to be fairly scrupulous in keeping to that schedule.

Sex Education is almost always viewed as the development of attitudes and information about the subject or the phenomenon of sex, and it certainly is that. In addition, there are two other aspects to it that are increasingly being emphasized by sex educators: one is the attitude of the individual about his own sexuality; What kind of person am I? What is the sexual part of me? How well is it integrated into myself? and the other is the attitude towards the opposite sex as a class of people; What kind of people are women? What kind of people are men? Those are the three aspects in sex education that I would like to take for my field today, and I'd like particularly to be concerned with the development of attitudes toward the opposite sex as a class of persons and toward the individual as a sexual being, if only because I expect some of your other discussants will have more to say about attitudes toward sex as a subject and information about sex as a subject.

I have a special interest in this field, aside from the fact that I have seven children of my own, which breeds immediate interest, and some of those seven are daughters. I've only found one parent during my life who was unconcerned with sex education and this was the father of three sons who said, "I let you fellows with daughters worry about sex education. I just tell my sons 'go get them'." I told him that I appreciated that and I'd watch out for his sons. Every other parent I've ever met, I think, has had some concern in this area.

My own academic interest in it, however, developed when I was doing a study of nursery school children's friendship choice, about eleven years ago at the University of Georgia, and I noticed a peculiar thing I had never learned in school at all. I had just been trained in some of the finest schools and I had just passed my comprehensives, and of course you never know more than you do when you have just passed your comprehensives, and I was asking children who their friends were, and who they liked best. I had devised a little game whereby they went fishing in a magic pond and they caught magic fish and they were to keep one for themselves and give one to the person they liked better than anybody else in nursery school, and I found something strange, and this was that if they gave the fish to somebody of their own sex everything was okay; you know, "My buddy Johnny gets a fish," but if they were giving it to someone of the opposite sex they suddenly got all giggly and coy and arch and shy. All these kinds of emotional things were happening with nursery school children which indicated that they made a very important differentiation between boys being boyfriend, and girls girlfriend; And girls, if anything, were archer than boys were in their idea of cross-sex friendships.

So I went back to look in the text books to find out what we knew about romance on the four-year-old level, and I found we didn't know anything about it,

it wasn't even supposed to exist. Children at this age scarcely knew about sex differences and such that they did know had to do with length of hair, and who wore skirts, and so on, and had nothing to do with any emotional relationships. Then I read that before they ever had a chance to find out anything about sex they immediately went into a latency where they forgot sex, they became slightly homosexual in their orientation, and everything else that we press because of mother.

So here I was seeing one thing and reading another thing and couldn't understand, or I didn't compute, as the television program used to say, and so I thought I'd better look into this and find out about it. So I started talking to nursery school teachers, and found that they were perfectly well aware that children had romances at this age. In fact there was some unscheduled observation going on in the bushes and they had to clip the bushes at one particular nursery school, and although that's not necessarily romance, it's still viva la difference, I think. So I decided to do a study of children's development of interest, attitudes, and orientation toward the opposite sex and toward themselves as sexual beings, and so far I guess we have collected data on six thousand school children ranging from Kindergarten to High School in Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Missouri. Although this is not anything like the broad example that I suppose would be ideal, at least we feel we have some notion of what the process is by which children become heterosexual.

I must say one other thing peaked my interest in this area; I'm also a marriage counsellor and if there is anything that is miserable it's the sex life of people that come for marriage counselling, by and large, that is. There are exceptions, of course but often more and more it seems to me that the roots of the problems that people have, or that they have invented between themselves can almost always be traced back to the problems in the kinds of experiences and attitudes they developed as they were growing up.

So we began a study. Well without telling you more about the process of this study let me give you some idea of the sort of natural history of heterosexuality as we have traced it. Interestingly, the first appearance of heterosexuality that we study is in the nursery school. Now, I am not going to go back into the parents' relationship with the child of the opposite sex, and so on, which also is a fascinating and important thing. I don't think anyone, whether they were Freudian, Anti-Freudian or non-Freudian, would doubt that important attitudes about the opposite sex and about your own sex, too, are developed in the interplay between people in the household, everything from a little girl's relationships with her own daddy to what her mama says when she comes back from around the block having left her wet pants on the corner. The degree of intensity of emotional response and so on certainly are all important, but we picked the kid up in nursery school, now; and the most significant thing, it seemed to us, was the attitude these children had not towards sex itself, but towards the institution of marriage. That seemed to make the big difference. That is the most obvious thing about the sexes, they live two by two with children. In our society as viewed by the children themselves, most of whom are raised in a family with a male and a female adult, long before most of these children have any concept of the sexual content of the marital union (they have no concept of intercourse or this type of intimacy), they have a very clear notion that men and women live

together as adults, that the natural, normal end of man is to live together as a man and a woman. This poses a problem for the child because he says, "That means that when I grow up, I am going to be living with someone and I am going to be in this kind of arrangement with someone of the opposite sex," and that puts the opposite sex in a special category.

What we have come to call the heterosexual potential is always there, and it is this that makes a boy-girl relationship from the time a boy or a girl first notices that the fact that the world links men and women in marriage is the standard thing. Now, when I say standard you have to remember that the latest census shows that in the age group 35-45, 95% of all Americans have been married at some time. They may not still be married, but by the age 35-45 only 5% have never been married, and when you exclude the Catholic clergy and religious groups, who are well represented here today, which pleases me greatly, and when you exclude people who are incompetent to get married for various mental or physical reasons, and I hope the clergy will forgive the categories, the homosexuals and other groups who are not able to get married, why, this reduces the percentage greatly.

I taught a graduate seminar this summer on sex research, in which we went over the Kinsey Studies, the Masters and Johnson Studies and all of the significant studies of this generation, and among our students were a Catholic nun and a couple of boys who had come up through Catholic school systems. Now, these boys took some joy in diminishing the social distance between them and the nun (they had a lot of things to pay back after all these years), and one of the best lines that the nun used to tell on herself over and over again was that on about the third day of classes the boys promised her that the first professional meeting they saw her at after the seminar they would yell to her from the hall and say, "Hey, Sister Victoria, I haven't seen you since we had sex together at Penn State."

To get back to the original point, 95% of all Americans do get married, so when a kid observes that this is the world of the adult, he is really observing something very accurate.

Now let me point out an interesting thing, and this is that at different ages different children seem to decide that they are going to get married someday, that this is the way they are going to live. We found that at one nursery school, and this nursery school is not a real sample, it's relatively small; we have much better samples of the later ages; (the nursery school group is a university-community type group and I don't know how representative it is), exactly half the boys decided that they are going to get married someday, decided that is what they are going to do, and just a bit more than 60% of the girls decided this also. Then, at every subsequent age, a larger proportion of the boys and girls decide that they are going to get married, and by the age of twelve, as many girls as are ever going to get married, that is, about 94%, are sure they are going to get married someday. The boys are a little slower to come up to it.

Now, there is one significant group that differs from others. As the boys get closer and closer to marriageable age, the percentage of them who truly want to get married someday increases except for one group: in all our studies,

the Negro slum male at about the age of 12-14 begins to become progressively less interested in marriage. I think this is a commentary on our social situation; marriage for this person becomes increasingly more burdensome as a concept and he realizes that it is going to be less rewarding to take upon himself the formal responsibility of wife and children, and the ambiguous role of the male in a female-dominated household, etc. seems to be little enticement for him. This is the only group in our whole study, which included Negro females, that did not systematically increase its desire for and appreciation of the marital state as it approached the age where marriage might be a reasonable possibility. This does not say that their heterosexual involvement decreased, of course, but simply that the fundamental notion of living together in a state of marital relationship for this group uniquely did not increase.

For a majority of the children, this is a major concept. I know that when my oldest son was three he had a very good idea of what fathers do. I remember distinctly that when they played house and he was the daddy, he would kiss everybody goodbye, put on my old rainhat and go out and ride his tricycle on the porch. And then, for about five minutes he would do nothing, just sit there on the porch. Then he would get back on his tricycle, ride back in, kiss everybody hello, pass out money, then sit down and read the newspaper: so, you see, he knew all about what daddies do even at such a very early age. And an interesting thing, at least among young children, is that no further development down the road that I am going to describe to you, that is, towards heterosexual involvement or orientation, occurred until this had occurred. Now, this is not true after puberty. After puberty, even if you are not interested in marriage, you are interested in sex anyway. I don't want to indicate that this is not so, but up until puberty, at least, any progress down the road of heterosexual orientation was based on this foundation. This came first and the other things came later because once you establish the notion that you are going to get married someday automatically you start looking around for whom you'd like to marry. If we have time I have some wonderful anecdotes about children as they discuss this question of whom they are going to marry. Girls are more likely to discuss it than boys because it seems to cast, in a girl's world, the largest shadow of their lives, they have a larger consequence, as they view it, I think, than boys, who tend to be more occupationally orientated, although both sexes are concerned about this.

So the next thing to do is to start looking around for a likely candidate; even at this very early age. I remember distinctly my own first grade heart-throb, my sweetheart. In fact, my best boyfriend and I shared this girl, which had no consequences at all because we didn't do anything with her, merely shared her inside ourselves. I can't remember what insults to her reputation we defended against but I do remember a fight with some other boys who said something bad about her once. I can't remember what it could have been, but it didn't really matter: it was an honor just to be fighting in such a cause. And I found out that even then my mother was a typical mother: on Parents' Day that year, I remember bringing her to school and telling her she should meet this girl, who had an odd name; she might even be here for all I know. Bobbie Wadsworth was her name, and I remember my mother's reaction when she saw Bobbie: "Seems to be a very ordinary girl."

So children, even at these early stages do seem to, inside their own skin-if not in actual interaction with other children, rehearse all the emotions of romance and love; again, girls are more likely to do it than boys, but both are likely to daydream and write scripts. I remember distinctly, in those days when a knight on a white horse had different connotations from a detergent ad, having fantasies of sweeping down on my white horse to rescue the damsel from some group of villains (heaven knows what they had in mind), picking her up, and sweeping her onto the horse. You know, it seems to me she would end up behind me, but I don't know how you sweep up a girl in this direction and end up with her behind you. I never thought of that problem before. Anyway, come to think of it, I don't think I'd have known what do do with her once she was on the horse either, but I do remember that distinctly and I am sure you have your own memories.

And these little scripts were all programmed for safety. For example, there was no chance in my dreams of the girl kicking me and shouting, "Put me down!" Something like that just couldn't happen. The way I dreamed it, she was always thrilled, pleased, and worshipful. And similarly I think of the somewhat older girls now who are just crazy about these long haired fellows with the highly amplified guitars and so on. What could be safer? There he is in a little box and he's not going to be jumping out at you. You can just give your whole body and soul to him and it costs nothing. He's not going to reject you, he's not going to compare you with some other girl, and he's not going to take advantage of your pure devotion; he's not going to do anything that you don't program him to do. You write the script and it happens just that way. You're rehearsing for safety; he's going to say this, I'm going to say that and you're rehearsing what it's really going to be like when you're truly in love.

Another interesting thing is that at every age, clear up through high school, about half of the kids were in love and were in love for the first time in their lives within the previous year. Now either something happened the year before we did the study and one-half the people in the world fell in love or at every age kids really find what being in love is. That is, "I'm in sixth grade and I'm in love." "Well, what about the girl you had in the fourth grade?" "Aw, that was puppy love. That didn't count. That didn't have any meaning. It was just a crush. Now this year, this is it!" I had a roommate in college who used to do that every six weeks. He had to redefine marriage each time. "That didn't count. This is the real thing."

So love is something that they redefine as they go along and it's interesting to see that they do it in this sequence as I have indicated to you. First they decide that marriage is going to be their eventual goal, then they choose a girlfriend. In the early grades, at least, this has no consequences outside of their own skin. That is, for example, if you ask all the children in second and third or even fourth and fifth grades who their boyfriends and girlfriends are, you will not find many reciprocal pairs. Maybe 20% are reciprocal, and you can get that by chance in a classroom. So you must assume that these are not real pairs in the sense that there's anything happening even socially between this couple. It's merely somebody that you like. I remember one classroom where seventeen boys had the same girlfriend. Obviously they weren't all going out with her, or walking home with her, or eating with her; they were just having her for a girlfriend, rehearsing ideologically with her,

and using her as an object of their affection. Of course, it doesn't have to be a classmate; it could be an adult, or a personality, of some kind, or a public figure or something. So we see there is definitely this kind of rehearsal.

Now at the same time that children are rehearsing the emotions that gradually come to be tested out in real relationships at different ages, depending on how long they have practiced, they begin to think about going out with members of the opposite sex. In the case of a boy, he first feels that he has a girlfriend, then feels that he is in love with this girlfriend (this year's definition), and now he starts thinking that it would really be more fun to go out with her than with another fellow. Now, this is a crucial point we have found: you can ask children one year "I'd rather go to the movies with--" and a girl will answer, "a girl," and a boy, "a boy." Some might answer, "I'd rather go by myself," although there aren't many who would rather do that. I was really surprised that about only 20% of the boys are really anti-girls. Most of them talk that way, but if you give them options a surprisingly small number of them will really reject girls in their inner heart, and this is directly related to how they have to behave when the group is all around.

Well anyway there comes a point at which, building on this sort of pyramid, a fellow decides that it would, if you had more courage, be more fun to go with girls to the movies than it would be to go with another fellow. But he still hasn't done it because he hasn't got the money, the transportation, or the guts. But he knows he'd like it; it seems, in his head, that it would really be more exciting, more fun. Now, of course, the next step is to do it, and he'll do that when he gets the money, the ride, and the courage. I remember very distinctly the chief thing that recommended the girl with whom I had my first date and that was that I was sure she was not going to say "no." All the girls I knew and I might ask I systematically excluded one by one because I couldn't be sure they would not turn me down flat. But this one girl I had known from the time we were little and I knew that, unless she had some real legitimate reason, she would never shoot me down. It turned out that many years later I married that girl, as a matter of fact. But that was different; that was because I couldn't get through graduate school because I couldn't type, and I had to get married.

So eventually, children get into the funnel or spiral of boy-girl relationships where the boy has the job of pressing towards intimacy, however he may be motivated to do it. And girls, I think, misinterpret this to some extent, blaming it all on the animal nature of men. There is some of that to be sure, but I think all you have to do to demonstrate it's more than that is to ask a girl what she would do if a boy never made any move at all, if he was a perfect gentlemen at all times, never tried to kiss her, never tried to put his arm around her, never tried to hold her hand, merely open doors for her and payed her way, never making a move. Well, after so long she would begin to wonder what was wrong with her, or what was wrong with him, or what was wrong with the relationship. She'd say, he's not doing what he is supposed to do," and I want to put the emphasis on "supposed". The boy has the burden of pushing a relationship towards more intimacy. Let's say this relationship continues, which is natural. The guy thinks, "this girl and I

had a good time this time, so I am going to ask her again, since we already know we can have a good time. And I'll probably be going with her until something happens, and we are not getting along very well. Then I will look around for somebody else that I can go with. And if nothing terribly bad happens and we go together for a while I am expected to push for intimacy, and she, in turn, is supposed to regulate my pushing," and I think that one of the things that galls girls is that when a boy doesn't push she has no opportunity to defend her virtue, which she has been waiting to do. If we had more time we could talk about this aspect of the boy-girl game.

To be sure, the girl is pushing too, but she is pushing for assurance, commitment; she wants to know if he loves her, if it is serious or not, whether it's right to be doing this when they aren't even going steady, when they're not engaged, when they're not even married. The girl is always pushing for more security. She, may say, "This isn't good. You don't even love me." He'll come back with, "I love you, I love you," which makes everything alright and she starts taking off her sweater.

So girls press for commitment and safety in a relationship and boys press for intimacy. And intimacy rates more commitment, and more commitment rates more intimacy, and this gets to be a spiral that carries people in our society to marriage. We have to have some way of doing this, you know. We don't have a specialized mechanism, an agency like SCOPE, for instance, that has the responsibility of getting people married. Everybody gets married on his own and if it was really a voluntary thing where there were no pressures upon it, you couldn't get 95% of the people married. You never could. You can't get 60% of the people to vote, for example, and that's a patriotic commitment; you can't get 70% of the people through high school and we have all kinds of ads and so on on that.

Yet without much help at all, 95% of the people get married, so it just can't be like some of my sentimental co-educators would have it, that it's like a wedding cake; you build a foundation, then you go up another layer, and then you go up another layer, and finally on the top is the bride and groom. If it were like that, you couldn't get 10% married; they would be lounging around on the bottom layer somewhere. It has got to be like a cake with slippery sides. You can go to a grocery store and look at the women going through with the carts and you can tell that you don't have to be pretty to get married, you don't have to be skinny to get married, you don't have to have a nice complexion, you don't have to be free of body odor. Everybody gets married sooner or later. So we have a very efficient system and it begins with the necessity of a boy finding a girl to share these social occasions with and a girl also having to find a boy.

You know, I am still puzzled to this day, with all my sophistication, such as it is, about this one thing: at lunch one day back in high school, after having ticked through all the possible girls, my boyfriends and I finally decided who I was going to take. Well, I was in the same English class 6th period with that girl, and I asked her out then. But there was something I didn't find out about until after we were married, and that was that she knew 3rd period that I was going to ask her. I still don't understand it.

I would like to back up a little bit now. We have been talking about emotional practicing, practicing in the safety of your own mind a relationship that often isn't very safe in real life, playing all the roles so it all works out well, and seeing that you are not challenged, which is tough in high school. One of the things that we discovered is that if you give children a chance to tell stories about the boy-girl situations, they will almost always come up with uncomfortable stories. One would think the older a child got, the more comfortable he would become, and the more savoir faire he would have, and the better he would know what to say and do. But on the contrary, the older the kids get the more "for real" it is for them. For example a 12-, 13-, or 14-year-old boy can take a girl's pencil and run with it, that is, engage in what we in this study have come to call pre-romantic teasing, and this doesn't call for much social skill. But what do you do when you have to stand there and talk to the girl and make decisions about whether now is the time to hold her hand, and if I do, will I get wiped out, or what would you think about this, and so on. And the girl's sitting there thinking, "why doesn't he say something? Does he like me? What's the matter with him? What's the matter with me?"

And we found that, in general, the older high school kids got the less certain they became and the more anxiety there was in their boy-girl relationships, which was interesting. I guess the stakes were getting higher, for one thing. Boy-girl relations, especially first meetings between a boy and a girl, usually call for responses of tenseness and discomfort.

But there is another kind of practicing that goes on which I just want to touch on briefly. This involves social skills; flirting, dancing, kissing, the kinds of things you want to be able to do well when you are called upon to do them. But where do you ever learn these things? Well, for kissing you've got kissing games. I don't know what it would be here on the Island, but I know I've been in communities where third to fifth grade was a typical time that children play kissing games and other communities where it took place in Junior High and even 10th grade. It will always differ from community to community. Now, what is a kissing game but a safe opportunity to practice kissing. They have a bottle spin, for example. There is one basic principle here, and it doesn't matter whether there is a bottle spinning or some other factor; first of all, it is a rule that everybody who is there has already agreed to be kissed, so there's not a question of any wrestling and, "Are you going to or not?" If the bottle points to you, alright! Secondly you can count on not being turned down, and you can count on not being overlooked, except by chance. And you don't have to take it personally.

So we have a chance to kiss without taking any social responsibility for it. You can say, I didn't ask to kiss you, and you didn't ask to kiss me, but we have agreed to play by the rules of the game and the rules say I kiss you and you kiss me." I must say the first time I ever went to a kissing party, I was caught entirely by surprise because it was a Sunday school party. I never expected such a thing. And I remember it just happened that I was the 3rd or 4th one whose turn it was to spin the bottle, and I remember getting the girl I had known all my life (and wasn't particularly attracted to, for that matter). We went out to the kitchen and I said to her, "Do you think those other kids are really kissing when they come out here?" and she said, "I guess

'you'll have to figure that out for yourself.' I didn't like her attitude.

But here again is a time when it's safe. What is going to happen out in the kitchen? At best, you're going to get two or three kisses. Things aren't going to go too far, and at the same time there isn't going to be no kissing. It's just safe, there are no consequences.

So here you are practicing a skill. And dancing is much the same. I remember a couple of big girls in our junior high school that taught all the boys how to dance whereupon the boys left these girls and danced with the girls they wanted to dance with. These girls had enough recruitments, however. But they were willing to let you step on their toes. It's sort of pathetic when you look back on it now, but at the time you could hardly wait until you got enough confidence with these girls so you could leave them. These girls did informally what dance schools and etiquette schools do formally -- give people confidence in the social skills that they think you are going to need.

I have to tell you one more story, (I see my time is getting away from me here) and then we'll have time for questions. I remember, in regard to this business of learning how to kiss, I had a special problem because I couldn't figure out where to put my nose. I couldn't see any way to get close enough to a girl to kiss her and the picture of trying to get close enough and not making it was humiliating. So I was 14 and had still never kissed a girl. But I had a friend who has a nose just as big as mine and he claimed to be a real cassanova. So one day I said to him, "Where do you put your nose?" Well, he hadn't really thought about it that much, and he was trying to explain it to me when finally he made my sister sit down between us and with the promise that we wouldn't actually kiss her, she let us practice putting our noses in the right place.

So the next Friday night I had a date with this girl and it was all set up; I was to have the back seat, and in the 9 miles to the dance from this girl's home I was going to do it, and all my boyfriends were saying, "Go Carl." So after the dance I was nervous and excited, but I had it down exactly how I was going to do it. And what happened? I got in on the wrong side of the car! Well, it suffices to say, then, that there is a progression of orientation towards the opposite sex that goes from practicing in kissing games and other skills and the emotions you practice inside your own skin, to that time when you too venture forth and put your own commodity, yourself, on the boy-girl market, to finally getting caught in this intimacy-committment funnel that leads eventually to marriage.

My wife got mad at me when I did this on television once. I had this big funnel (mounted on a pipe that ran from the floor to the ceiling) and it had signs designating the various levels of intimacy and commitment. And when I got home I was quite pleased since it had been my first time on television, but I found my wife noticeable cool and when I asked her "What is it?" she said "Nothing!" Well, I finally got it out of her. She said, "Well, if that's all you think of marriage - down the funnel and down the drain--"

That's not it, really, but it is true that it's not that there is just one funnel that you get into. You see, you can get into a funnel, and might

go too fast and you may begin to get too intimate or too committed, but there are what we call filtering passages, which we could talk about if we had time. In these filtering passages people who decided they were in the funnel with the wrong person can get out. You see, it's hard to back up in the funnel; it's very hard once you have achieved a certain level of intimacy to go back to an earlier level. For instance, it's very hard for an engaged couple to go back to going steady. It can happen, but it's easier to get out of the funnel and into a new one. As one of my students said, "it's like a pin-ball machine where you have the flippers to keep the ball going for a while, but eventually you lose your nickel."

That is the model that I am going to suggest to you, and I am suggesting that all kinds of exciting and important things happen in the age between kindergarten and puberty. Sex and the importance of sexuality or heterosexuality is not invented when the hormones start racing round and adding their important contribution. This is something that begins with the first perception on the part of a child that men and women together make up the world. Before he has any notion of genitals or what they are for, he has a notion that men and women have a special relationship with each other and from that moment on his sex education, whether anyone ever had a little talk with him or not, is in progress, and the question you are met here today to discuss, I presume, is what you can do to make the progress of that education more successful and satisfying for the individuals that are involved. Well, I would like to entertain comments or questions from you for fifteen minutes.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Audience: Would you say that the approach that you use, the serious research approach, is the attitude or approach that teachers should use in sex education classes?

Dr. Broderick: As I understand it, you perceive my approach as being serious, and students won't enjoy it, is that right? Well, let me examine my approach with you as you have seen a sample of it here this morning. My approach is to make sex as human as possible. That is, on the contrary, I do research but what I am doing in my research regards warm human relationships, and I think my approach would be to have my students see me as a person who is sexual like they, themselves are; not a nasty old sex goat who is trying to get laughs by making dirty comments but someone who faces the same type of problems that they face or have faced.

I did a circuit in the St. Paul Diocese last winter on sex education where we spent two sessions with the parents and two sessions with the children and the most uncomfortable thing about that was that the parents felt so uncomfortable with the nuns there. I said to them, "I don't get it. What is it?" Their opinion was that the nuns were not supposed to hear these things. I told them they have been getting dirty notes from the kids for all these years. They are professionals. They have to work with every kind of problem. You see, they have had very bad press. These people don't want to see them as having sexual dimension. I don't know what it is that it upsets in them, but it upsets something important.

I think some of the clergy have a problem, though not a real problem in terms of being able to deal with the problem. People can always, if they are unhappy people, change. After all, these girls weren't born nuns, for one thing. But I am not concerned with their problem, but the problem of the image they project, and I think what is true of nuns is true of teachers in general: if they preserve this image of being a separate sex, almost set apart, I think that, for myself then, the thing that I would do would be to approach this with as much warmth and humanness as I could and get it as un-antiseptic as I could. Now I am aware that there are some people who can get away with that and some people who can't. But you asked me what my approach would be and that would be it. Whether it's research or something else, it always has a human aspect to it and for myself that is what I would want them to feel.

Let me tell you something. I have seven kids. And I know people who feel that the last thing they ever want to tell a kid as a responsible adult was that sex was fun. Now that is the most obvious thing about sex. It's the first thing they will ever hear from anybody else. To understand any sexual joke you have to understand that sex is enjoyable, and yet I know parents like my own mother, bless her heart, who will tell you all the facts, but always leave a strong implication that, "Well --- your father and I wanted to have a child and the way God fixed it up there just wasn't any other way. So through our love for you we did this." And I remember going to church the next Sunday and looking around and thinking, "Boy, that old son of a gun - four times he did it!"

Well, I think I want my children to understand about this. I know there are those who are concerned with what sex should not be, but I think the capturing of children's imagination of what sex can be is a much more dynamic and successful philosophy. Some people worry about premarital pregnancy, so they say, "Be careful or you might get pregnant, or you might get venereal disease, or you'll get caught and your reputation will be ruined and you will go to hell." They can avoid all this by being careful, be careful, be careful, repent, and God understands these things a lot better than parents do anyway, they really can. They are not too swayed by these things, but if I can set up with them ideals, standards that have some meaning for them, I'll feel we're doing the right thing. I don't say, "Save your pennies because it's bad to spend pennies," but I say, "Save your pennies and buy something good that is of worth to your life," and it's a good talking point.

So for myself I think this antiseptic, around-the-edges, I'll give you all the facts but you'll have to work out the human part of it with kids is for the birds. I want to be the one to give them the context for working out the human part of it and if I want to do that I have to get in with them, be human with them, and share with them. My kids understand, I hope, partly from seeing their mother and myself like each other, (we have a warm relationship between ourselves), and partly because we talk to them about sex. We talk about sex as something that is enjoyable and is good, and because it's good has to be treated with some respect, and not that it's dangerous and bad, and because it's bad ought to be avoided until you can't possibly exist any longer and hope that that will be just after marriage and not before.

Now if anyone else dares ask a question, go ahead.

Audience: What do you see as the role of the school in Sex Education and relate this in context to the role of the community, church, etc.

Dr. Broderick: I am a parent and also an educator, and I think the school represents the community. And just as the community has an investment in marriage and therefore you have got to get a license to get married and the community has an investment in divorce, therefore you have to go to court to get a divorce, I think the community has an interest and a commitment to the development of healthy sexuality, because if you don't have healthy sexuality, you pay for it. Now I am not suggesting that anything to do with the schools is going to stop the divorce rate on the one hand, or the pre-marital pregnancy rate, or venereal disease. We have not demonstrated that that is so and we don't know it's so, but I do think that the school and every other community agency have a responsibility to young people.

Now many parents have, through no fault of their own, inherited a lot of incapacity; sometimes they are just unable to talk to their children even if they want to, and others are able to talk to them all right, but they are so damaged themselves in this area that the things they say are solely in the nature of warnings. I think the community has the same kind of responsibility for mental health and sexuality as they have in any other area. Now, I don't think anybody should relieve parents of their responsibility, but we all know it's true that parents don't always carry out their responsibilities to the fullest extent, so I don't think that the community should abandon the children in this regard. It's not class oriented; it's not just the poor, deprived children who have no mommy or daddy at home and so on who are the ones. Good, solid, middle class people are botching up in this area.

So I think that the community through the schools and through many other agencies has an obligation to do what it can and it can do one important thing. -- it can give information that parents cannot give because they don't know how to give it. I had one mother pathetically come to me, and I hope there is no one here like this, said, "Doctor, I want to talk to my child about this, but we don't share the same vocabulary that we can talk about it in." Finally she blushed and said, "The only words that I could use that my child knows would be to say 'your father's wee-wee goes into your mother's wee-wee.' Now how can I talk about sex to my child in this way?" Well, how can she indeed?

So, I think you have an obligation to teach the right or usable terms to this generation so that they can talk with their own children, first of all. Secondly I would, myself, whenever possible, bring parents in and do some educating with them at the same time. I would for example, not let parents be part of the discussion because children need the privacy and an opportunity to ask questions without their parents being there. But I would see to it that parents had an opportunity, if not with the children, then apart from the children, to see the films that are shown, for example, "Boy to Man, Girl to Woman," or even the menstrual film or whatever, so that they have common understanding, common background and don't feel threatened by the school, but they can talk with the child about the things the schools is doing.

So information is one thing. Another thing is attitude. When you

teach information it always is taught with an attitude, and as a marriage counsellor, my observation is that, sooner or later, everyone gets enough information to procreate. Rarely do you ever find a couple who comes and says, "We can't have children." "Why?" "We don't know how." It almost never happens. Much more often they will say, "We can have children, all right, but that is about all we can do that is enjoyable, and that's not so hot either." Then it's the attitudes that we communicate that are the vital factor. Information is good and you're more comfortable with information because you're educators and you think information is, perhaps, your currency, but you know that is not true. You know that the main thing you do is serve as models for the children that come into your classes, and the main thing they learn from you is not the facts that you teach, but the feelings about the facts that you teach. Maybe you don't know that, but it's true, and if I had time we could discuss the research with children that prove that it's true.

Audience: ?

Dr. Broderick: I don't think you can. I think what you have to do is choose people who are not emotionally crippled to try to help others along. I don't think you start with an emotional cripple in this area, and say, "What can I do now to help this person to be able to teach sex?"

Dr. Broderick: First of all there isn't any one answer, is there? I think if you are talking with slum kids who already have a fully developed vocabulary, you would be able to communicate with them in their vocabulary. What I would be concerned about is that you try to do something, I don't think there is any one revealed way. As far as I know, you can read all the revealed scriptures that there are, and nobody will tell you how to do this. It's one concern that something be done. Talk with the kids; they will have ideas in terms of vocabulary, and then make an effort to proceed from there. I am not concerned with whether you do it the way I do it or not. You have a different personality, and what I can get away with and what may work well for me might not work for you at all.

I am concerned that people do something, that they don't sit around waiting for the millennium to come when all these problems are solved. I know programs that use all the four-letter words and they seem to succeed. I know programs that use all the Latin words and they seem to do all right. The important thing is, it seems to me, that no matter what the vocabulary, what you are projecting is a lot of yourself, a lot of humanness. Sex is human, sexuality is human. I would not deal with sex education at all, if it were just biological facts. That's important, of course. There are many high schools (I hope not on the Island), where in biology they leave out the stuff on reproduction once it gets past frogs. That's the cutting point. I am suggesting perhaps you should do something by saying, "OK, reproduction is just part of the human body. People aren't blank from the waist down." I suppose that is important, teaching an accepting attitude. I wouldn't knock it. It's a step beyond where a lot of people are. But I would go further, you certainly aren't blank from the waist down, but in addition to that, some important parts

of your body involved with your own sexuality are there, and they are parts that are too important not to talk about and I would think I would want to talk about that.

Audience: How do you view the moral aspect of sex education at the elementary level?

Dr. Broderick: If by that you are referring to the fear that people have that they are going to have to talk to children with a different moral than that with which their parents talked to them, either on the one hand trying to teach children morals that are not appropriate because they live in say a lower class slum where there is all kinds of copulation going back and forth at some very early ages and they are trying to enforce the old middle class ethic, or that they are going to be more free-thinking than the rigid or spinster type of parent. I realize that's a problem.

The answer I would have for that is morals as values, or what to do with sex, is a subject for discussion but you don't have to come up with a doctrinaire answer. By that I mean I would talk with people about decision-making in this area, talk about the kind of information that people would need to make decisions in this area. For example, if this is a religious school, one important factor in decision-making is "What does God say about this?" If it's a non-religious school and they don't officially believe in God then I think you can say, "All right, what about human dignity and human worth?" Lester . . . has written a book in which he has developed a whole non-religious ethic for sexual behavior based on the humanistic philosophy of love of your fellow man and non-exploitation.

You see, I am suggesting that even at the elementary school level this type of frankness is desirable. I'm going to give you one concrete example. I was talking to a group of teachers in Detroit a while ago, and one teacher asked, "What would you do with this situation: we were watching guinea pigs suckle during our second grade science class and I made the point that this is characteristic of all mammals; mammals suckle their young. And one little girl said, "Human's don't" Well, the teacher was sort of unresolved as to what to say and do. She finally said, "Well, some do and some don't," and went on to something else. Now, I think that's fine and maybe she had other important things to do, but I think for myself I would have taken the opportunity to say, "Some do and some don't, and this is an interesting question: what are the kinds of things that you think might make some people decide that they want to and others not?" I think children can come up with all kinds of good answers. Now, I am sure to get some feedback from some parents but I don't think there's any reason for it unless the teacher ended up by saying, "So children, you ought to suckle your young because if you really love your children, you'll do that," or, "Today, with wonderful bottles and other conveniences only a clod would ever suckle their young and be tied down." If the teacher doesn't go with that kind of a thing then I can't really see where a basis of upset on the parents' part is.

Well, I wish we had more time together, but I do thank you for this time.



DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG

"Is Sex Education in the Schools the Solution?"

ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG, Ph.D., N.Y.U.; studies at the Universities of Naples, Florence and Sorbonne. Presently, he is Adjunct Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University, Professor of Psychology at New School of Social Research, and a practicing psychoanalyst. Dr. van den Haag is a Fellow of the American Sociological Association, Royal Economic Society, Guggenheim, 1967. He wrote the following books: Education as an Industry, The Fabric of Society, Passion and Social Constraint. Dr. van den Haag's writings also include chapters and articles in numerous texts and magazines.

I want to quote to you something that, about a hundred years ago, was said about education. It was quoted originally by Richard LaPierre who, and I paraphrase, said that "Education, it was said, would be the cure for every recognized social ill: the schools would cost the taxpayers nothing since the educated boys would grow up to be reasonable and honest. The need, therefore, for public support of jails, poor farms, and homes for the aged and indigent would be eliminated." That was said a hundred years ago, and, as some of you must have noticed, it hasn't come quite true.

Nonetheless, educators seem to be incurable in their ambitiousness. Let me quote again, this time from Lawrence Kremmen, an historian of education. He says, "When there is an annoying social problem in other countries, the people stage an uprising. When there is an annoying social problem in the United States, the people organize a course." We have not changed. We remain of the conviction that when anything is wrong anywhere, a course organized to teach people about it will make everything wonderful.

Now, education is a process of learning. But you should try to realize that not all processes of learning are educational in the sense of schooling. That is, you learn numerous things in numerous ways other than in the formal schoolroom situation.

We're here today to discuss the effects, and in particular the usefulness, of including into the process of learning in the schoolroom formal instruction in regard to sexual behavior. I wish to remind you in the beginning that not everything that can be learned and should be learned can be taught or should be taught. Those who favor these courses in schooling in sex education usually have in mind, and I hope in the given period you will mention some other possible goals, such goals as these: first, people think that anything that is of any importance should be taught in the schools. Second, some people expect some special advantages: more reasonable or desirable behavior with regard to sex, marriage, and family living, less premarital intercourse, lower rate of pregnancy, that is illegitimate pregnancy in general, (I don't know if marital pregnancy is included), and less venereal disease.

Now, all those, undoubtedly, are praiseworthy goals. Who can ever be opposed to desirable behavior? The only goal is whether it is likely that courses in sex education are in any way helpful in achieving these goals. It seems to me that the school is only one of many learning institutions in our or any other society. Most societies in the past indeed have done without that specific learning institution called the school which instead arises for very specific purposes, not to harbor the processes of learning in general, but to teach certain specific things which people are unlikely to learn outside the school. If you want to learn anything, Greek, or ancient history, or medieval theology, you are very unlikely to learn it outside the school. On the other hand, if you want to learn how to behave in marriage, I am not sure you can learn it inside the school and I'm sure you can learn it outside.

The conclusion drawn from that is that schools should and need to specialize in those things they are most apt to be able to teach and should try to avoid those things they are unlikely to teach fruitfully. There is an

assumption that the school should teach the whole child meaning, in effect, that there are no other institutions influencing the personality and characteristics of the child and leading, in effect, to the neglect of subjects that should be taught by the school: you teach the child but you don't teach the subjects. At least, as far as my experience goes, they don't learn the subjects. What this amounts to is a necessarily ineffective attempt to influence the personality of the child.

I will now say a very simple thing: if there is one specific proposition of modern psychology which distinguishes it from not-modern psychology, it is very simply that personality is not affected by any process of cognitive learning that the schools can give you. That is, no listening to lectures or such is likely in any way to influence your emotions. Because if it were otherwise, I would lose my living. Clearly, in psychoanalysis we try to help a person change some of his characteristics not by lecturing to him, and we do that because merely by reading a book or giving a lecture, as I give myself, on how to behave, would not help him to behave in the way in which he might want to. And in terms that Aristotle called "ecrasia," which the bible correctly refers to when it says that "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak," that is, in the terms we have learned since the Platonic Socrates, who, as you will recall, thought that virtue is knowledge, a view that was imitated by an early heretic called Philogenes.

Since that time I think we have learned very much: that human knowledge is not only influenced by knowledge, it is influenced by emotion, but emotions, in turn, are not influenced by knowledge. Otherwise, life would be much easier than it is.

So this is one reason why I think teaching right sexual conduct is ineffective. Another reason, and a very simple one, is that there is no agreement as to what sexual conduct is right.

I would like to briefly repeat the two points I have made. On the one hand, we don't agree on what is desirable social conduct, and on the other hand even if we did agree we could not get people to engage in it simply by lecturing to them about it. What we have in the first place is a conflict of values. Values groups in the community have different views on what kind of sexual conduct is correct and should be fostered. The school, however, is a value-transmitting agency, transmitting values not so much by lecturing but by its disciplinary and other powers, and cannot possibly teach "this conduct is right" or "that conduct is right" since there is no agreement in the community among teachers and so on. Value conflicts, in turn, are not solved by knowledge. If there is a disagreement about facts and such, further research can possibly establish what the correct facts are. But when the disagreement is not about facts, but whether or not they are desirable and acceptable then I think knowledge is entirely irrelevant to begin with. In comparing someone like Mozart with someone else like Wagner, all the facts in the world about Wagner, about his life, his descendants, his income, how he composed his music, and whether it's louder or softer than Mozart's and so on will make no difference in your evaluation of preference of one for the other.

More important even than this point is that the value conflict that I have

just described depends on the whole, as far as the individual is concerned, to be a conflict between biological impulses and normal restraints. The person who engages, say, in premarital intercourse may do so because he or she approves of it, but he or she may also do it even if it is disapproved of nonetheless because a certain impulse, given time, becomes stronger than his or her normal principles. I do not believe that teaching that it is right or wrong will affect this to any major degree. And if you're worried about pregnancy it does not seem to me that any girl who engages in premarital intercourse and becomes pregnant did so because no one told her that one of the effects of intercourse may be to become pregnant. To my knowledge, all girls who engage in intercourse, other than those who are raped perhaps at a very early age, with consent are fully aware of the fact that this is indeed the way to become pregnant. Nor do I believe that teaching them about contraception will reduce the rate of pregnancy, for again, I do not think a girl engages in premarital intercourse and becomes pregnant either because she didn't know that intercourse would lead to that or because she didn't know that there are contraceptive methods to prevent it.

Again quite apart from the value concept some people believe that contraceptives should be used and others don't. Assuming that the girl is in favor of using them the likelihood is that she won't, not because she didn't know about it but because when she went out on that date with that boy she hadn't planned on having intercourse. Very few girls make up their minds beforehand. In fact, in my modest experience, girls make up everything else before they make up their minds. To assume, you see, that the girl got pregnant because she didn't know about contraception overlooks the most important thing. That the girl in question, almost any girl, as I said, does not plan, she does not face the possible or even probable facts that she may end up doing something she had not planned to do and not wanting to face it means that she will refuse to prepare for it because to prepare for it would mean that she has admitted to herself what she refuses to admit to herself.

Now, why this is so I don't really have to go into at any length but I wish to call to your attention that the trouble arises not from not knowing but from being in some sort of conflict about what the conduct she will engage in is, and that conflict will not be resolved by telling her that "if you don't use this you will get pregnant" as if she knew this all along. She says to herself "I won't do it" and she ends up doing it and because she does not wish to predict to herself that she will end up doing it, she will not prepare for it.

I may call to your attention, if you are interested in this, that the rate of illegitimate births in Sweden is somewhat higher than in this country, and I will also call to your attention that sex education has been given in Sweden longer and more extensively than in this country. I do not wish to conclude that sex education leads to illegitimate pregnancy. I wish to conclude, however, that it doesn't prevent it. And the same may be said about venereal disease, and so on.

I will go on and say that there is no evidence whatsoever that courses in marriage and family living, so popular not only on high school and grade school but also on college levels, have ever been of any use in improving (whatever that may mean) marriage or family living. The point is the same that I made

before: that knowing how to act properly, which is what you can learn in such a course, is not the same as acting properly. The person who commits a murder is not usually a person who feels that murder is justified or reasonable or that he should commit a murder. He is a person who is driven by an impulse to do something that he, himself, knows he ought not to do. The person who doesn't get along with his wife is not a person who has failed to take a proper course in college on how to get along with your wife. He is a person who, for one reason or another, has married the wrong wife, or is the wrong person, or does have difficulties in human relations which arise from his personality and not from any ignorance.

I would now ask the same about an argument which I have often heard about sex education that somehow will teach people to have healthy, or sound, sex against unhealthy or unsound, sex. And now here is where the distinction lies. Any sexual activity engaged in by a healthy person is healthy sexual activity, and any sexual activity engaged in by an unhealthy person is unhealthy sexual activity. In other words it is not the sex acts that are healthy or unhealthy. They become so in the context of personalities who use them in this context for purposes that are ungratifying or, if you wish, unhealthy. Now, again, I don't know of any way in which the school, by teaching you to be healthy, makes you become healthy. Psychological health is not something that can be taught. It would be nice if it could be, and I would be willing to make a living in some other way. But I don't think it can be done.

Let me conclude this then. I hope I have said enough, at length, to get some of you to ask me some questions, so I hasten to conclusion to give you the floor. My general view is very simply that we have always placed excessive expectation upon education. The background for that, and it is a very long background, and I will not go into it too deeply, basically is our fundamental belief that, -so to speak, "man is born good," and that he becomes bad, or corrupted, only out of some sort of ignorance and that, therefore, education is the sovereign remedy to make him good again. Let me point out that this is fundamentally an unchristian belief, and is also a fundamentally wrong belief, in the psychological sense. For whether you resort to St. Augustine and the original fall which gets us in the position to constantly struggle against evil in ourselves to become reasonably good, or whether you put it in the term in which Freud put it, in terms of id and an ego that has to constantly struggle to control this id with the help of the super-ego and so on, makes very little difference. The point is that men are only born, not born good. They are born and born endowed with all the impulses which, if uncontrolled, lead to what we would call a "criminal career."

The process that we call educational socialization helps us, to some extent, to control these impulses. But as far as the controlling of the impulses directly is concerned, it is not done through a process of formal schooling. It is not done through any form of cognitive knowledge or information, important, that is, in other respects and the major task, in my opinion, of the school. That process, the process of emotional molding, so to speak, which happens in the first few years of childhood depends very largely on treatment very early in the family. Now you may say "why don't we influence the parents to teach the children?" and so on and so on, but the

trouble is that the parents will teach the children according to their own personalities, which, in turn, are not going to be influenced by lecturing too. If you are unlucky enough to be born to reasonably neurotic parents you are going to be a reasonably neurotic child. If you're lucky enough to be born to reasonably healthy parents, and if you're also lucky in other respects, you may become a reasonably healthy child. I do not believe that the school can do anything about it. Sometimes it can discover people who have special difficulties and try to send them to specialists who may be able to help them.

But, now, if you let me point this for a moment back to sex, most personality problems do express themselves, among other things, in the area of sex. It does not follow that they are caused by this area, a very frequent misunderstanding, too. But then, you see, we live in a period where sexual knowledge is more widespread than at any other time in human history. It seems, therefore, in the face of it, paradoxical to say that we need more sexual knowledge when we have, in a sense, more, and it is more widely spread than ever before.

The point of the matter is this: you do find, of course, some people who are peculiarly ignorant about sexual techniques, practices, activity, something that you may call sexual morality, whatever we may mean by that, and so on. But I think it is a mistake to assume that this ignorance is due to lack of information; it's the other way around. Information is not absorbed by such a person, from the sources of experience; "learning by doing," as you are familiar with, because he is blocked against the absorption of that information. And the blockage is due to matters of personality and cannot be removed by telling him rationally and informing him about such and such. If I have a neurotic patient and I tell him, "Bob, you don't have to wash your hands every two hours. They're really not that dirty," and so on, he is not going to be very grateful because he knew this all along. He has a compulsion to wash his hands which he cannot control by a rational means. What I have to do to help him is find out what it is in his personality that leads to this compulsion. It is not a matter of lack of knowledge.

Similarly I would say with ungratifying sexual practices, or practices that for any reason you regard as undesirable, it is not that the person doesn't know better, it is that he is impelled to act in the way that he does act for reasons that I do not think are likely to be modified by imparting any rational knowledge as you can in a classroom to him. I should say that courses in sex or about sex are, at best, unnecessary and a waste of time. Now this is not to exclude a course, in the normal curriculum, about biology in which human anatomy is discussed. There it would be foolish not to discuss sex, which would be put into a very peculiar and a very special position. But it is not the same as sex education. It is simply a course in human physiology, or anatomy, or whatever else you may have. Again, if you discuss philosophy, I don't think you have much occasion to do that in grade school or so, but if you do, you have no particular reason to leave out consideration of people's relations with each other, including sexual relations.

Finally, if you have a student who feels he has a problem and has enough confidence in you, whoever you are, and it is to be desired that he have enough

confidence in a teacher and wishes to ask this teacher about his problem, ask for his advice and consent, I think it would be cruel and foolish, and you would be derelict in your duty, not to do everything you can to give him the advice you can give him, which usually consists simply in listening to him, possibly, and saying how you would act and what some other people might do, and so on.

I do not call this sex education because it is simply a duty which one human being has to do for any other. I call sex education specific courses set up for the purpose of informing, molding, impressing, and influencing people about sexual activity in the moral, psychological, and biological aspects of it. And I regard these courses, as I have said, as, at best, innocuous.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Moderator: I'm sure there must be some questions. I would like to insist on two things: first of all direct your questions to the person who has just spoken for the whole afternoon and secondly make your questions as brief and to the point as possible so that we can answer as many questions as possible in the time allotted. The question period will run until 2:25. Yes, Frank?

Audience: Dr. Van Den Haag, please. Is it not true that the field of work in which you are involved deals mostly with abnormal psychology? And is it not true that in dealing with the learning aspects of old subject matter, especially on the elementary and secondary levels, such as we are particularly concerned with here today, cognitive knowledge does lead to skills, attitudes, and working habits, and that these are all based on the learning process? Is there a dicotomy here between abnormal and normal psychology?

Dr. Van Den Haag: The answer is "no", that's not where the dicotomy is. And, incidentally, there is no dicotomy between these two. The person who comes to see me is usually a person dissatisfied with himself for one reason or the other. That person may not have anything more wrong with him than a person who never comes to see me. The latter simply accepts himself more, and is even satisfied if he gets less out of life. You see, there is a difference: if you are a person in Rumania and you beat up your wife every Saturday, you would be perfectly satisfied. But if you are Gloria in Manhattan and you beat up your wife every Saturday you will end up seeing me. But it doesn't mean you are more ill than the person in Romania.

But, at any rate, to come back to your point in both normal and abnormal persons, attitude is not formed by absorbing cognitive knowledge, if, by attitude, we mean emotional disposition. If we mean skills which you also mentioned, then of course we depend on cognitive knowledge, but the use you made of these skills, no. What's more, attitude, in the sense in which I think you used the word, is formed within the first five years of life and is not greatly changed at all.

Audience: You might as well quit first, give up the job.

Dr. Van Den Haag: That might be a good idea in some cases. But let me point out that if your idea of the mere fact that you are being employed to do something must necessarily mean that what you are doing is meaningful, you are wrong for that does not logically follow. And if you look back in the history of humanity you will find that many people were employed to do many things that we regard as highly useless today. I wouldn't be totally unconvinced that the future may have something to say about our activities in this field today. But if your activity consists in trying to teach attitudes by lecturing in the classroom I should think you should give up, yes. But if it consists in the imparting of cognitive knowledge, I think you can do something very useful, precisely because I think the school is very useful in doing that and I think we should try to specialize in it.

Audience: Are any external social factors relevant to attitude formation?

Dr. Van Den Haag: If I understand your question, "Is it purely an intrapsychic process or is it also inter-", all right. Well, you know, that strikes me as a strange question, because if you look at such things that you certainly have heard about as the Oedipus complex or so you know that this is an interpersonal relationship. The Oedipus complex certainly involves the relationship of the child to his mother, father, and siblings. What could be more external? And of course there are many other external factors that may play a role. What I said is that lecturing, imparting cognitive knowledge, will be irrelevant.

Audience: I used the word 'social' intentionally, Dr. I can understand how an interpersonal relationship can be meaningful as information in psychology of a person. I was attempting to project social as, perhaps, something mass. Is there any social, as opposed to interpersonal, factor relevant?

Dr. Van Den Haag: Well, I suppose there is. I think they are somewhat dependent on each other. So if you look at something like the Moynihan Report on the Negro family you will find that Moynihan pointed out correctly that the Negro family, with respect to the way in which it is constituted, is likely to be a considerable influence on the personality of the Negro children, and I don't remember if he points out, but it is rather obvious, that the Negro family is what it is because of a variety of historical influences. So these things are connected but not in any direct way. The connection is indirect. That is, the character formation of the child depends very largely on what you have called interpersonal relations. Now, one end of the interpersonal relations is, in turn, dependent on society.

Audience: Would I be correct in saying that you believe that your formal education in leading to a Ph. D. in psychology and your studies to be a psychoanalyst were of no value in increasing your understanding, not knowledge but understanding, of your sexual being and your ability to help someone else?

Dr. Van Den Haag: My ability to help someone else is a skill which I have acquired through this education. But as far as my personality is concerned, and to the extent to which it influences my ability to help people, it has not been shaped by my education. Now, as you probably know, to be a psychoanalyst you,

yourself, must undergo psychoanalysis. But psychoanalysis is not a cognitive process. The non-cognitive process called psychoanalysis is the attempt to provide certain emotional experiences in the course of the transference, and it does, indeed, affect the character of the patient whether he is an analyst in training or in the analysis for any other reason.

Audience: So your formal knowledge as a Ph. D., your knowledge in a formal sense is of no value.

Dr. Van Den Haag: No, no that does not follow. That formal knowledge has given me this skill. Now, psychoanalysis is not fully as yet and perhaps never will be a science. It is both a science and an art. The skill that has been given me is knowledge by my formal education. In the process of analysis, my personality also plays in a variety of ways a role, and that, I think, has been given me, so to speak, by divine decree, be it good or bad, and has possibly been somewhat improved as a non-cognitive process called analysis.

Audience: Doctor, you mentioned two things. I'd like to contest both of them. First, you said that girls who become pregnant in their pre-teens and teens have intercourse with the prior knowledge that this will happen. But in a recent study done in British Columbia it was found that over 60% become pregnant without any knowledge that what they were engaging in would lead to pregnancy. Secondly, you said that education is likewise true in venereal diseases. And I contest that, too, because you, yourself, just said that skill and knowledge are learned through education. Now, if something is known about venereal diseases, if one knows what can happen, how to prevent it, the number of cases would be lowered. In a recent study in the social hygiene department of New York City, eighty percent of 600 cases of youths between the ages of 15 and 19 reported having had no prior knowledge, no formal education about venereal disease. Now, you cannot tell me that teaching students of that age about the consequences of having intercourse without any protective measures will not stop venereal disease.

Dr. Van Den Haag: Well, I can tell you and I will. Did you speak of a test in British Columbia? Well, I don't know about the teenagers in British Columbia, but I do know about American teenagers, and I do not think they become pregnant because they do not know that intercourse may lead to pregnancy. I simply think that this is common sense. Moreover not knowing the study you are referring to, I may be allowed to suspect that some of the teenagers who became pregnant, when interrogated by a benevolent interrogator, "How did that happen to you?" might have answered, "I never knew that this would bring this about," which may not be the most sincere response, but merely a way of avoiding their own responsibility. I think such studies are of, how do you say it, doubtful usefulness. I do not think that the trouble with teenagers of the United States who become pregnant is that they don't know that intercourse leads to pregnancy. And I think that any attempt to propagandize this fact: "be careful, for intercourse may lead to pregnancy" is likely to reduce the frequency of intercourse. What you might want to do, and I should personally favor it, since we now have invented a variety of contraceptive devices of fairly easy technical use, including the so-called "pill," would be to make pills available without prescription to anyone who asks for them. I have never been able to understand why they are not so available and I regard

this as a medical "racket". There is no reason why they shouldn't be as available as vitamin pills. It's entirely true, of course, that these pills are contra-indicated in very few cases, and not too seriously. But if you were to say "let's not sell anything without prescription" that may harm certain sufferers from a previous condition. You would be able to sell sugar only on prescription, since sugar, after all, may harm very much a person who is affected by diabetes or so.

I think that the reason that a girl should restrain herself from engaging in intercourse should not be fear of pregnancy. I think it should be moral or psychological restraints, which, I am afraid, cannot be taught in the school. I don't think it should be fear of pregnancy, and therefore I would advocate these pills being freely sold.

Now to come back to your second question, it is, of course, seductive to say, "the person who has caught venereal disease was not fully aware of the risk," or "the person who neglects to do something about it in time was not fully aware of the need to do so." This is not what I have found. There are, of course, some such cases, but I'm trying to deal with the majority of cases, and in the majority of cases the teenagers, and, as you know, venereal disease is particularly associated with teenager, who is infected by venereal disease knew remotely that there is such a possibility, but did not wish to prepare or assume that it will happen to him. Similarly, he may be ashamed, worried, embarrassed, or simply neglectful in doing anything about it.

If you look closely at the hippies, where there is a very great degree of venereal disease, I do not think that they have the venereal disease because they have not heard about it or do not know about it. They have a generally neglectful attitude about such matters. Again, attitude, I do not think, is going to be changed by teaching them about it.

You see, I do not oppose your giving the class a lecture every once in a while about venereal disease. I think it's a waste of time, but I really don't think it will do any harm. On second thought, in the case of venereal disease, it will do some harm. The likelihood is that some of your students are likely to understand that and construe that in terms of their own guilt feelings and feel sort of a "crime-and-punishment" relationship: "If I do this I may be punished by venereal disease," which will have considerable harm on their future sexual life. So I'm a little doubtful that it will do any good. It's useless, unnecessary, and it might even be harmful.

But what I must ask you to try to understand is very simply that, you see, we have problems here. These problems are not due to ignorance, they are not going to be removed by getting people to act differently from the way they're acting. They are acting in the ways they are acting not out of ignorance but fairly much in possession of those facts they wish to be in possession of, excluding those that they wish not to acknowledge because it is psychologically inconvenient. I should say that, if a girl in America (I don't know about British Columbia) seriously engages in intercourse without knowledge that it may lead to pregnancy, she must suffer from a very advanced case of repression of easily available knowledge, that is. She does not wish to know this because it is inconvenient to know so. This is not going to be

changed by lecturing to her, either.

Audience: I think, Dr. Van Den Haag, you have raised an interesting question for education. Is it possible, then, that we must be discriminating about who we teach, because if we can do nothing in terms of the values and attitude that these youngsters will hold it is criminal on our part to teach all children, and we should be selective and identify those kids that would benefit from the education and would not become a cancer on the society? Is that possible?

Dr. Van Den Haag: If I had a way of doing it, I would be in favor of it. But neither you nor I have a way of doing it. In other words, if I understand your question correctly, if a man has a murderer's disposition, what you're saying is, unable as we are to influence his disposition by educational means, it would be a good idea not to teach him about guns because he will merely use that to be more efficient in his murderer's disposition. Now, if we could identify in time the man with a murderer's disposition, I would fully agree with you, but I don't think we can. Further, if we could identify such a man I would also be in favor of trying to get him to take special treatment which would get him to switch his disposition. But it won't be changed by a classroom lecture against murder.

Audience: Dr., have you seriously studied the programs that are being presented in curriculae throughout this country, specifically those in Anaheim and Everston, Illinois? Have you studied the curriculae that are being proposed in this country?

Dr. Van Den Haag: Yes.

Audience: If you have, I cannot think how you can conclude that this is some kind of an antiseptic, preventative, informational-lecture formal approach. The words that you use tend to give me the impression that the sex education program is lecturing at the student a formal education telling him what to do and what not to do instead of involving the child in a real educative process. I don't see how you can use phrases like rational knowledge, cognitive process, formal psychology, lecture approach, if you really understand what these people are proposing in the sex education programs that we are presenting in this country.

Dr. Van Den Haag: Well, people who are very dogmatically convinced of any particular viewpoint always have difficulty in seeing that someone may understand their view point and yet disagree. They always say, "You can't possibly have understood me". I have, and that's why I disagree with you. I do not think that there is a possibility in the classroom to do anything but impart cognitive knowledge. Now when I used the word "lecturing" I used it as a short-cut; I had in mind high schools. In Illinois, for instance, they do this in grammar school, and so on. They use, of course, an appropriate approach which does not involve lecturing but involves the usual thing you do with small children: playing games, teaching by various kinds of demonstration, and so on. It is in no way different in the relevant respects. It is still cognitive knowledge, and it still cannot affect emotional dispositions.

Audience: I just got the impression, Dr., of a totally determined human being

who has various segments dissected, and that fragmented human being is me. I don't buy that.

Audience: Dr., as health educators, we are taught that we should impart knowledge in such a way to change attitudes that eventually will change behavior. Now what I would like to know is do you believe this, and if you don't believe it, do you mean to tell me that health education is completely a waste of time?

Dr. Van Den Haag: Well, if it is at all dependent on what you describe it as being, than certainly I agree: it is a waste of time. On the other hand, I think that it does not have to consist of this, altogether. I am not sure what is meant by health education, in various circumstances, but let me put it this way: if I teach philosophy my purpose is largely to impart what knowledge I have about what various people thought about various philosophical problems and what I, myself, think about them. This can be quite helpful knowledge. Now, if health education involves teaching what can be done about health, what can be done to avoid sickness and so on, it teaches the students a skill which they might wish to acquire. Knowing that skill will not change their basic attitudes. But these attitudes may be, to begin with, such as to make this skill very useful to them. You see, this differs somewhat from sex education because I do not think that there is any specific skill involved, as far as I know, and I do not think that this skill needs to be acquired by any formal teaching process. If it is a skill the non-pathological person acquires it by his own experience.

Audience: Dr., I think if we understood your theory of man, we could understand your views on this subject better. How does man know the concept of will within a man and what is the relationship between knowledge and free will? When is man free, and how does man know? A great deal of your talk was devoted to your views of man as man, and I would like to hear what you have to say about this.

Dr. Van Den Haag: I'd rather withhold that because I think it will lead us too far from sex education. I will say this, though: I think man's actions are predictable yet free. I will quote Calvin, if you wish:

which means, "man falls, if God lets him, but he falls of his own free will." This is my view, on the whole. I do think that we have a responsibility for our actions because we are, in a sense, free, though the use that we make of this freedom can be predicted. If I didn't think so I wouldn't think there is any science possible, and that there is any point lecturing about anything. But what I really wish to say is that the determinants of our actions include certain cognitive factors but the determinants of our actions in the area which we are now discussing, as far as direction is concerned for individuals, tend to be emotional dispositions not affected by cognitive knowledge.

Audience: I would like to ask a question about a wonderful area which our discussion has drawn us into, and that is group therapy. Aren't we talking about the same thing, only from different points of view?

Dr. Van Den Haag: I hope so.

Audience: Do you accept the fact that the difference between the basic impulses of a normal and a pathological person is that the pathological person has a great deal of difficulty containing his impulses, the control mechanisms are not coming through and the unconscious motivations are directing his conscious level of activity? The pathological person is pretty much directed by the id impulse, whatever we want to call it, but if we assume that even 40% of the population is incapable of functioning at a conscious, cognitive level where they can suppress the impulses by a learned process, how about the other 60% that is capable of making judgements, those who are able to control their impulses according to conscious knowledge which they have received and who say, "although my unconscious behavior presses me, I recognize it and will suppress it for the ultimate goal of attaining something that I realize is a gain for myself." Are we not dealing with this in education, those who are capable of suppressing it?

Dr. Van Den Haag: I wouldn't quite agree with all of your formulations, but I think we could easily come to an agreement if we had the time. So let me accept what follows from it, and that is this, if I understand you correctly: those people in the 60% range who are responsive to their own restraints, so to speak, would become more responsive if you only gave them a lecture about sex. That is what I am denying.

Audience: No, that's not what I meant.

Dr. Van Den Haag: Then I haven't understood you. And if you don't mean that, then I don't see where we disagree.

Audience: I was talking about personal relations. Does it make a difference whether we call it psychotherapy or classroom?

Dr. Van Den Haag: There is a great difference, I am sorry to say, between the classroom and psychotherapy, and I wish that teachers would consider this difference a bit more thoroughly than they do. Psychotherapy does not intend to impart any cognitive knowledge whatsoever to the patient. I hope, as teachers, you do. You see, if it were a matter of cognitive knowledge, well, my patients would do much better and would pay much less money by reading a good book. I don't pretend to know more than Freud, or any other person. If it were a matter of cognitive knowledge, of knowing that this and this relationship with their mother, say, led to this and this disposition, I could tell them that in five minutes. I will usually know what is wrong with my patients in a fairly short time, and so do all psychoanalysts. The art of psychoanalysis consists in helping the patient not to know it but to experience it, in a specific, so-called transference situation which tends to be a corrective emotional experience. This you cannot do in the classroom, I am sorry to say. You cannot do it in the classroom for a variety of reasons; you have a mixture of students and they each have different needs, different abilities, and so on. This makes it fairly hard to handle on just the cognitive level, and trying to handle it on the emotional level would be quite impossible.

Audience: Dr., we agree that learning is not virtue. But where in your psychology does motivation lie? How do you define motivation? Are you a behaviorist?

Dr. Van Den Haag: That is another of those far-reaching questions that I would like to avoid. You see, every scientist is necessarily a behaviorist in the sense that he studies the behavior of things, people and whatnot. Of course, I am, too, in this sense. Now the word behaviorism is also applied to a particular school of psychology which has its own particular restrictions and so on. I am certainly not a behaviorist in this sense.

Now I come to your point about motivation. You use the word motivation, I guess, pretty much as I use the word emotion.

Audience: But Dr., the complete teacher, the educator, wants to motivate, not to control.

Dr. Van Den Haag: Well, I think he ought to do both. But I think you're quite right; he does want to motivate, but let me say two things about this. First you motivate your student best by not trying; it's a little bit like the pursuit of happiness, wherein you achieve happiness not by pursuing it directly but by pursuing some other aim with which happiness is found incidentally. You motivate your students by having a certain integrity toward your subject matter, by making efforts to help them learn that subject matter. When they see your own interest in teaching them the subject matter, they will be motivated. And on the subject of the influencing of motivation, let me add that it can certainly never be influenced by saying, "Let's motivate you," and giving students a lecture on how they should be motivated. You can't possibly do this by the way you deal with them in the classroom and by the way in which you deal with the subject matter.

Let me apply this to the subject we are speaking of in general: if you are interested primarily in influencing the sexual behavior of young people, I think it can't possibly be influenced by the way in which you, yourself, behave and by your own attitudes toward sex, in sex and out. That is not, however, something that you teach them formally. It is something they perceive by perceiving your own personality. I do think that a teacher, in his relations to his students, can have some influence, not on the basic character but on some unfortunately marginal matters, but he still cannot have this influence by imparting cognitive knowledge but by being what he is. And what he is he doesn't learn in a school of education, he just is it because of reasons of his own that made him what he is.

Now, if you have a teacher who has the right attitude, whatever that may be, toward sex, I think such a teacher may, in his relations to his students, influence them to some extent, at least in non-pathological cases, and so on, but not by any formal instruction. He may be a teacher of mathematics, and the students may perceive how reasonable and decent a person he is, and what his relations are with girl and boy students and male and female teachers and whatnot. It may have some influence, but I, in my own opinion, don't think so.



DR. ESTHER SCHULZ

"Practical Aspects of Introducing Sex Education into School Programs"

ESTHER SCHULZ, R.N., Ph.D., graduated from Indiana University with formal preparation in Counseling and Personnel, Nursing Education and Sociology. She worked in rural and urban public health and school programs. Recently, Dr. Schulz joined the SIECUS staff as Associate Director for Educational Services, which has involved her in numerous developments of family life and sex education programs. Membership in professional societies include: Fellow of the American Public Health Association, the American School Health Association and the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

I am delighted to be here. If you can't hear me distinctly please wave a hand. I am suffering from the residue of an upper respiratory infection I brought back from Florida and I now have the problem of an ear that makes me sound to myself like I'm talking in a vacuum. I might not be too distinct and if I sound mushy please wave frantically and I will try to speak more clearly.

Fortunately my role, at the end of the program, is not to discuss what's taken place before, not in the form of trying to offer any sort of a persuasion or dissuasion, but simply what we call the nuts and bolts of this whole matter. So I will base my remarks on the premise that the whole area of education for sexuality is one of utmost importance, one that is being discussed nationally and internationally, I might add, because we at S.I.E.C.U.S. are being questioned, from every section of the world, about what is taking place here, what can be done, how we can help other countries develop curriculac that will be appropriate for their own particular population groups. This whole area of education for human sexuality certainly has taken on a bandwagon approach. The reasons for this I will not take time to dicuss at this point.

I use the term "education for human sexuality" specifically because I think there needs to be some definition of what we're talking about and unfortunately "sex education" has been used in such a loose way. People all across the board, when they're talking about sex education, say "sex education" without a specific definition, but by innuendo mean the plumbing and the sex act, so to speak. So we say "education for human sexuality" with the idea that we are involving the whole behavior pattern and interpersonal relations that go along with this state of being masculine or feminine.

So this is the basis of what we think about when we talk about education for human sexuality in the schools. Now, within the school curriculum it may come under the heading of interpersonal relations, family life and sex education, sex education per se, education for human sexuality; a myriad of different titles that, in essence, in the area of interest, have to do with the helping of boys and girls to understand themselves and the totality of masculinity and femininity and the interpersonal relations that go along with this state since we are not islands.

Now, talking to you as educators, I want you to realize first of all that what I have to say is in essence geared to the school population for which we are planning when we set up programs or curriculum guides that have to do with the amplification of educational opportunities and activities for the students. The first people we think of are those in the heavy majority of our student body, the so-called normal students. We know that we have the atypical students who must be worked in and those people are special problems. I, unfortunately, in the short time I have cannot delve too deeply into the things that we're trying to do in behalf of the emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, and physically handicapped children. Let me say we are concerned with them and we're taking some special recognition of these people along with those people who come from the socioeconomically disadvantaged areas. I will try, in the brief time I have, to talk to you about what the steps are that one

takes in developing a sound educational program.

First of all we work from, as I said before, a format which extends from the fact that the community has said, "We want something done," and this is certainly being said right across the nation from Alaska on down to the Virgin Islands most recently, and everytime I say this I always get a few little snide remarks from the punsters. But in every place boards of education and other educational groups are asking, "How do we implement into the curriculum this area of education for human sexuality which we must do because the parents are saying 'we want something done'?" Unfortunately the parents are worried. They're concerned because they read the newspapers and they hear the statistics of what some people say are and some say are not the typical extent of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, venereal disease, etc.

So the first thing we realize when we talk about programs in sex education for human sexuality is that this must be done on a positive basis. If our idea is that we're only going to have these programs to acquaint young people a little more with what happens during the sex act or to appease parents and some other community people and show them that we can do something to prevent out-of-wedlock pregnancies and V.D., then it's better to not start the program at all. Think of it as you do any other area of educational endeavor: it must be done with a positive note. I might say as an aside, and I won't charge you extra for this one, that one of my great quarrels with much of what is being done in broad-base health education in some of the other areas of concern is that it is being taken from a rather negative approach, and I am not sure it is getting across. I'm referring to such programs such as those in narcotics and V.D. fields and some of the other areas of concern that should be of concern but unfortunately are being taught from a "scare" approach, are teaching the "don'ts" rather than some range of probability of the "whys" and the "why nots." Hopefully, then, this whole area will be considered from a positive standpoint.

The basic purpose that we have in mind, then, in thinking of what constitutes good sound education for human sexuality, is what the behavior that we hope to see evolve from our educational efforts, as we do in any other area of concern, will be. I can, in certain ways, I guess, liken this to this matter of getting young people ready to exercise their franchise of vote: we start in the early grades and build them up by teaching about the world around them and the influences of the environment. I have a little nephew, for example, who is not in one of the ungraded programs but would be equivalent to early first grade, who has a tremendous interest in space. And it depends upon who gets to the magazines first whether or not the rest of the family gets to read them because anything that has to do with space he cuts out. He belongs to the space club. He is learning about the forces that are important to us these days from both the legal as well as scientific standpoints.

So we start building in the earliest grades this whole concept of what the forces are that influence the child as an individual and what he must know about these legal and social forces that give him the knowledge of how to vote. The justification of all this activity takes place in the form of looking at the statistics of the number of young people today, for example, who don't

vote the same as their parents as opposed to many years ago when the family patterns followed along. We have given these young people some range of latitude in discussing and thinking for themselves the issues involved rather than saying, "There are two parties and you vote for one or the other." We think back not too many years when there were many problems in this matter of getting to include in the school curriculum the various governmental ideologies. Much of what we're going through in this area of sex education took place at that point because there were many communities, families, and school boards who wondered about and questioned the validity of including anything other than our so-called democratic form of government and now this is very much in the past.

So now we have reached the stage of asking ourselves, "What are we doing with our young people? What do we want to see in the way of behavior?" and we don't mean voting behavior now but behavior in the matters of interpersonal relations as relates to this whole area of masculinity and femininity and in the responsibilities that go along with this state. Hopefully as these young people come out of the twelfth grade they will have developed for themselves a set of values that is their own and that will determine their behavior. Certainly at no point do we see in our school program the necessity to tell the young people what's right and what's wrong. I am always being approached with this, as I talk across the nation: "Who is going to teach the students the morals? Who is going to teach them what is right and wrong? Who is going to teach them the great American way of life?" and I always have to say if somebody can tell me just what our American ethics or our American standards of behavior are then I might be willing to go in and teach. Certainly we have no American standards as such, as we look at the various behavior patterns that are condoned within the various segments of society.

So our purpose, in essence, then, is to help these young people to be very aware of what they're going to meet when they arrive at the twelfth grade level and are ready to move out into the world and society - it is sort of an elongated systems approach, so to speak, where we look at the terminal behavior before we decide what we feed into the funnel down here. We begin to hope that young people will be able to behave in a responsible manner without guilt or trauma because of uncertainties. As I said, we start way down here in the earliest grades.

One of the things that I have to say over and over again is this whole area of sex education or education for human sexuality certainly is not new. There is muc' - eady going on in the school. One of the things with which I am always impres. d is how people approach this as speakers and groups talk about this whole area as if it were something brand new and of which nobody has ever heard. I'd like to see the early grade teachers who haven't had to talk to Mary and Johnny about where babies come from or had to introduce the little folks coming out of the middle class homes where they have single bathroom privileges to the very fact that there is a difference in the biological state or the external appearance of boys and girls.

And certainly the discussions of what takes place within the family

and the interaction of the family is discussed in these early days of the young people. A story that was making the rounds not long ago in New York City and which probably reached out here, but for the sake of those of you who may not have heard it, had to do with a teacher in the primary grades who used early in the semester as a theme for show and tell "A Happy Thought." Johnny's happy thought was their vacation camping trip and how his Daddy thought it was so great that they would go camping again next year. Mary's happy thought was that her Grandma for Christmas vacation was going to repay their visit to her house. Susie's happy thought was, "I think I'm pregnant." So with that the teacher discontinued "Happy Thought" and asked Susie why she had said that? She answered, "We were sitting at the table this morning when my Mommy said to Daddy, 'I think I'm pregnant.'" With this her Daddy said, "Well, that's a happy thought!"

So early grade teachers certainly are faced with the situation of looking at this whole matter of masculinity and femininity. Coupled with this comes the language arts programs; the stories that are read are very much centered with the roles of the Daddy and Mommy and the interaction of the family. The role models that the children use are their family members. Interestingly enough, we have learned from people who work in homes for children without parents that the theme that shows up in the play situation is the family; the Daddy does this, the Mommy takes care of the baby, etc. So the theme of the role of family members is quite already built in. I might add also that in many of these early grades the concept that all life comes from life is interjected through the plants in the classroom, though animals, etc. Hopefully, it is not with the idea that the children will ideologically transfer from the animals to human beings the whole reproductive process. Specialists in the field of early childhood have fairly well established the fact that this does not take place.

Anyway, the bases for this whole interaction of male and female members of society, and the role models best known to these little children, are very much incorporated so that it can be enhanced through planned learning activities. With the arrival into the middle grades come a deepening of the biological understanding. Hopefully there will be a greater depth of understanding of the reproductive system as one part of a series of systems within the body and not standing alone as a separate entity. I look forward to the day when we can retire this tired old story of menstruation shown at the sixth or seventh grade level (which is a little late anyway), where the girl has come with her white envelop containing parental permission to see the picture and is told not to tell the boys what you saw, all the while knowing who is going to hear it first. Hopefully this whole matter of learning about the maturation process, which is happening in many school programs now, comes into a normal sequence with the totality of learning so that it is not taken out of context, not made something extra special and different.

The socialization process then moves from the immediate family to the larger family; the people from other countries, from other societies, from other cultural groups, and is, in many instances, already built into the whole area of the social studies. As we move these youngsters through the elementary grades we encompass what we call anticipatory education, that is, the giving to

the young people of some factual information and some basis for understanding what they need to know as they get into the deeper concern with themselves in the junior and senior high ages.

Something that I have observed in educational patterns and which is quite interesting to me is the work of two different procedures. Firstly, some schools, particularly those in Alaska and other Northwestern states, are involved in the Program which is doing experimental work in decision-making with young people in very early grades. And this is quite a fascinating program because it lays the groundwork for what we hope will be taking place at a later age. We have not done that much for young people in the area of giving them opportunity to experiment with what decision-making really is. They have been too much subjected to being ordered and too little given the tools and the opportunities for decision-making. The other thing that is taking place in these early grades is the perception of behavioral responsibilities, the assessing of the behavioral act rather than the person who commits the act, such as Johnny Smith who breaks a window. With this new work we do not conclude that Johnny Smith is a bad boy but ask why the breaking of the window of the school was an act that was socially not acceptable, etc. Although this is a very, very small modification, an over-simplification, really, of this whole matter of evaluating behavior, you can see that there is some ground work being set down. The tools along with some of the factual knowledge are being handed out in these early grades.

Then moving on into the secondary years (since I no longer can say junior high and senior high, what with the Middle School Program now being so much in evidence as to make it difficult to define just where junior high comes in), that is, possibly sixth or seventh grade, or wherever children enter your departmentalized state, comes the matter of helping young people to have a dialogue-centered classroom in which they can, based on planned sequential topics, learn from each other, in an atmosphere of understanding, what they really want to know: the varying behaviors that they see around them or hear about, (and if they have not had an opportunity to really explore in depth they should be allowed so now, that they might know that people don't all behave the same way wherever they go.)

So by the time these young people get into the last of their high school years and are ready to move into the world they have some knowledge of the facts that if they go into Greenwich Village to live, for example, they might in some instances see a different sort of behavior condoned than they had seen in their own local community, or that if they go to college they might see quite a different type of behavior displayed than they had known at home. Here they might see the "big-men-on-campus" that are the extolled leaders and devotees of Ellis or Margaret Mead, to various degrees. Here they might find that there is a dire need to know entirely about your future marriage mate and that you live together, though without legal sanction, during the college years with the stipulation that there will be no children but that there can be, at a later time, the embracement of marriage that takes place with legal blessing.

And this last is a very devastating concept for some young people to gain

when they get into the college situation: they find a way of life completely different from that which they had known, and this I know from my own days as a college counsellor. These young people come in and say, "Well, if I want to belong to this group I must behave in such and such a manner." They have not been forced to perceive different situations and decide what they do or do not want before they reach those situations; they have not been given the tools by which they can look at and evaluate the behavior of various people and decide what they want for themselves in the way of fitting into the social patterns. Along with this we must help young people to know that there are deviations in behavior and this, too, must come into the discussions. Certainly mass media has done much in acquainting young people with the fact that there is such a pattern as homosexual behavior, and that society looks quite differently at homosexual behavior, in many instances, than it did a few years past. Certainly we have much more to learn about this whole state but at the same time we must help young people gain some knowledge about it. There are the matters of other behaviors that are displayed in conjunction with sex, such as masturbation, which still in the mind's eye of some people creates many problems such as blindness and other such consequences that have been related in the past.

So there is much we have to teach young people in the way of social interaction and behavior, and it must be formed into a well-developed course that is sequentially planned and not just a "what-do-we-talk-about-today,-boys-and-girls?" type of program. It must have a place in a classroom situation that is essentially dialogue-centered, particularly in the departmentalized stages of your educational processes. I would like to see, of course, more than just this area have the benefit of the dialogue-centered classroom and fortunately with our trend toward modular planning and flexible scheduling this can take place. But as a college professor I would like to see more preparation for the college seminar type of classes and this can take place when you have a dialogue-centered classroom which is sequentially and topically planned. It is an academically acceptable area and it should be planned in an academically acceptable way.

Now the question always arises: "In what area does this fall?" In the state of New York curriculum the educators are planning it in their health education program. I have discussed often times with John Sinacore, who now is on leave from Cortland, to try to develop this area to a greater depth. I do not see this as a full prerogative of health education. I think it cuts across all disciplines. If you relegate this to health education then it must be done with the knowledge that you have health education teachers who are well prepared, in a broad base manner, with a great depth of knowledge in the area of the behavioral sciences as well as the biological sciences. Some people say it belongs in physical education. Again you must be sure that your physical education people are capable of handling it. The pattern as it is showing up across the nation is varied. In some schools the whole area is handled on a very integrated basis so that the English or literature teacher who is working with Shakespearean plays and some of the novels can handle certain concepts while the sociology teacher handles others such as the problems of population control, etc. How this fits in your program certainly depends upon your own school. I will say this about such a completely integrated program: it takes both very tight coordination and raises some problems in being sure that you have

teachers who are capable of handling the area.

Now I would like to jump very quickly to another aspect since I have only a few minutes. Who teaches this subject? Where does it come into the curriculum, as far as teaching is concerned? Number one, I have great faith in teachers. I am not one who believes teachers are that unable to handle their own emotions or beliefs that they cannot do a good job in the classroom. Granted there are some teachers who cannot handle their emotions that well. I sometimes wonder how well these teachers function in some of the other courses, too. But I believe that in the elementary grades this area should be integrated throughout in a self-contained classroom with the classroom teacher handling the area and not bringing in the nurse or someone else who is not regularly a part of the teaching staff to teach this. Secondly, I believe, as we get into the upper grades (again, how you fit this into your curriculum depends upon how much you think you can work with your own teachers), in the selection of teachers who want to work in teaching the various concepts that go into education for human sexuality. In some schools it is being handled in a block form for this reason. In a block of time for a particular course children are rotated out of certain classes and into small groups for a dialogue-centered class. There are various and sundry ways of handling this so that selectivity of teachers may be made. But above all there must be good, sound inservice education for teachers. In no other area are teachers asked to function without some background. For instance, when New Math was introduced there were special teacher guides as well as inservice education.

So the teachers must have the opportunity to obtain some depth of understanding to broaden their background in the areas for which they have not had all the preparation they might need. Earlier this afternoon, Father mentioned something of "sensitivity training." I like to use the term "teacher awareness" rather than "sensitivity training." But there are concerted methods in which teachers can be helped to be aware of what their biases might be and the limitations they might introduce into the classroom itself, though I won't have time to give you specific illustrations. There are means of helping teachers and this has been fairly well-established by some of the programs that have been going on for a sufficient length of time to prove their worth, in which the young people, themselves, and the parents, would not let anything happen to this particular area of emphasis within their curriculum. And teachers in areas that are not specifically and directly concerned with the teaching of family life and sex education will report that they see a marked change toward relaxation in the students in other classes because they feel that there is a freedom of discussion now where once had been a strong traditional pattern of teacher-to-student recitation.

So there are marked benefits and I suppose there are some points of emphasis that are on the negative side, but we have to begin to look at some of the benefits that might be received. We are too recently introduced into this whole area to really point up long range benefits. Hopefully we will be able to in time but, as in all other educational ventures, we cannot sit back and wait 'till somebody shows us that it should or should not be done. We, ourselves, must explore. We, ourselves, must move ahead. You as educators should look at

what goes on within your classrooms now. Have your teachers be your curriculum writing committee. Develop and build on what is already there. Conduct inservice education. Take advantage of the many workshops that are going to be given in various institutions of higher education. And launch forth with a pilot program rather than a single program first so that your curriculum can be tested, tried, and modified. I think you will find, then, that yourselves and your community along with the most important people of all, those students, are going to be eternally grateful.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Audience: A question to Dr. Schulz concerning the pilot project that you spoke about: would you recommend a pilot project in one school in the district or a pilot project across all grades levels of all schools.

Dr. Schulz: It varies. I will say that most of the schools are trying it in one or two grades per level and in some places they are using one school as a pilot school. This varies decidedly according to how you want to fit it in.

Audience: Dr. Schulz, are you suggesting that each school faculty write its own curriculum?

Dr. Schulz: No. I am suggesting each school system write a curriculum that is appropriate for that particular school, and I stress this because the needs of children differ. For example, the readiness level of youngsters who come out of a highly urbanized area is quite different from that of youngsters who come out of the bush areas up in Alaska.

Audience: Dr. Schulz what do you have to say about parental involvement?

Dr. Schulz: I'm sorry. I intended to bring that up. First, when you have developed the curriculum to the level of any other curriculum area certainly let your parents know what you're going to offer. Have a Parents' Night or some other means of acquainting parents with what is going to go into the program. Work this in the same way that you did when you introduced the New Math: you let the parents come in so they weren't that far behind Johnny, so they had some notion of what was going on. Secondly, in trying to help parents at an adult education level, most school districts have found that the parents will say, "Oh, do something for us. We need it more than the children! Get some classes going for us." As a result the school develops an adult education class at which show up 150 the first night and 4 the next. But come that time when there is a program in the school from which Johnny and Mary come home with terminology that Pop and Mom don't understand, then they are ready for adult education classes, and these classes may take place through the churches in their adult education fields. I think this is one place the churches play a major role. When people tell me that it should be the role of the church and the home to educate the young people I always ask them how recently they've looked at the statistics of the young people who are not under the influence of a religious advisor. The church has much more contact, I think, on the whole,

with adults than they do with the young people. So I would say that the churches play a very major role in setting up some adult education classes. Certainly parents require some help. They want help in terminology and depth of understanding, not just marriage therapy sessions. They will be able to answer certain elements of the question "Who am I as an adult sexual being?"

Audience: I'd like to ask Dr. Schulz do you have any recommendations for procedure.?

Dr. Schulz: The first sensitizing and getting together of what really constitutes needs is done through some sort of an advisory group. In some instances it is essentially a parent-teacher cooperative, in some instances it is the bringing in of professional people throughout the community to talk about what the problems, anxieties, interests are. I would also like to reinforce what Father said this morning (and I can't reinforce it strongly enough), and that is the desirability of calling in some of the young people, say junior and senior high youngsters and asking them to act as a panel. They will tell you what they want to know and don't want to know, and they will also be able to tell you which of the audio visual aids the young people will buy or won't buy. Certainly it is very good to rely on the young people to give you some of the clues as to what their interests are. We, at SIECUS, will have, in the near future, ready for publication a great quantity of criteria for curriculae which we have accumulated from various schools and other sources. We will have available a directory which lists these schools and their curriculae making it convenient for you to write for any additional information such as the success or failure of the program, etc.